

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/909,474

Applicant(s)

BOYLAN ET AL.

Examiner

Maryam Monshipouri

Art Unit

1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(3) _____.

(2) Lynn L. Janulis.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7/9 & 9/16 & 11/18.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,62,70 and 71.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: On 7/9/04 the examiner called up the applicant to negotiate allowance of the elected claims directed to DNA, pending a minor amendment of claim 1. In response Ms. Janulis indicated that applicant would like to file a rejoinder under reochiai between elected claims and their methods of use. She subsequently faxed in an amendment to the Office. On 9/16/04 the examiner called the applicant to indicate the vagueness of steps recited in claims 62, 70 and 71. In response Ms. Janulis agreed with the examiner and promised to fax in a new set of amended claims. On 11/18/2004 the examiner called applicant again to request clarification of claim 62. In response, Ms. Janulis gave authority to the examiner to amend the claim as proposed by the examiner in an examiner's amendment..